



Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 003780-048

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Bernhard BOSSHARD et al

Application Serial No. 10/032,447

Filed: January 2, 2002

For: ADHESIVES WITH GOOD MECHANICAL
PROPERTIES, SUITABLE FOR USE
WITH ANTENNAS

Group Art Unit: 1712

Examiner: David Buttner

Confirmation No. 8140

#7
3/12/03
LC

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

RECEIVED
MAR 10 2003
GROUP 1700

In response to the Official Action (Restriction Requirement) mailed on February 7, 2003, in connection with the above-identified application, Applicants elect with traverse, Group I, claims 1-15 and 17, directed to an adhesive, and method for the production of the adhesive.

Applicants respectfully traverse the requirement for restriction for at least the following reasons.

In accordance with MPEP §803, an application may be properly restricted to one or more claimed inventions only if (1) the inventions are independent or distinctly claimed, and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. Thus, even if appropriate reasons exist for requiring restriction, such a requirement should not be made unless there is a serious burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims in a single application.

In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the search required for Group II would be substantially co-extensive with Group I since both sets of claims require the adhesive of claims 1 or 8. A substantial overlap in the examination involved for the two groups is therefore present such that the claims are best examined together in the same application.

It is further noted that the method claims of Group II depend from the adhesive of claims 1 and 8. In accordance with MPEP §821.04, such method of use claims are to be rejoined with the elected product claims when "a product claim is subsequently found allowable." In the present case, Applicants therefore further request withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement, and examination of all the claims together, since allowability of the product adhesive will require further examination of the method of use claims of Group II. It is believed to be in the interest of both Applicants and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to examine claims 16 and 18 with the elected Group of claims since these non-elected claims will be examined anyway in the event the product claims are found to be allowable.

In the alternative, should the Restriction Requirement not be withdrawn, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of claims 16 and 18 with the elected product adhesive (and method) claims 1-15 and 17 upon allowance of the product.

For at least the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and examination of pending claims 1-18 are respectfully requested.

If any issues remain outstanding, or should there be any questions concerning the above remarks or the application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (703) 836-6620.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: 

Mark L. Warzel

Registration No. 47,264

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: March 6, 2003